

in my mind. Is there anyone who can answer this definitively or is there an answer?

Dr. CAIN. I can comment and then I think that somebody else should supplement it.

These figures which are on page 11 of my statement are derived independently of any ongoing programs in Federal agencies, the \$20-some million that we identified in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is not included within this figure that you see on that page.

Mr. BROWN. Those are ongoing programs?

Dr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. How do those compare, say, for the last 3 years? Is this a normal extrapolation of what you have been spending?

Dr. CAIN. No, there is in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—and this is true of fiscal 1969 planning—there is an acceleration for everything pertaining to food from the sea. This is in response to the new National Committee of which Vice President Humphrey is Chairman. This is in line with governmental policy to emphasize the importance of food from the sea.

Mr. BROWN. But it does overlap to some extent what you are talking about for the biological program?

Dr. CAIN. Yes.

The other part of the question—I have no basis for suggesting how much they would be able to finance through normal budget through the Panel on Environmental Biology or otherwise. I can't say. There is money there. Our experience in proposals coming in directed to the IBP program has this kind of price tag.

I would be sure part of this could be carried today without any money, but I don't know how much.

Mr. BROWN. We have been talking about the normal increment in our need which is a healthy thing for our internal R. & D. program. This includes biology although the emphasis has been largely in the physical sciences, an increase in the order of possibly 15 percent per year.

If we are talking about this kind of an increase in R. & D. budgets, including biology, and I am using R. & D. in a rough sense here, it seems to me that NSF should have some funds which they could program with this kind of an emphasis that the international biological program has in mind here and what we are talking about is not really \$136 million in new money, but the directing of certain funds which would normally expect to channel into R. & D.—a specific type of program.

And for budgetary purposes, I am just wondering whether there is really going to be any substantial increase or not because you are talking about a substantial increase already in this one area of fisheries resulting from a demand from another source.

There are other areas which are likewise being increased because of other demands.

I have only seen this administrative fund of a million and a half dollars over 5 years. That ought to be separated out. We ought to be able to define and channel the program more, probably.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Keck?